

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I

EVOLUTION AND DESIGN

MANY have expressed the opinion, that the "Argument from Design" in proof of the Existence of a God, which Paley was the first to popularise,¹ and which I have here² attempted by familiar examples to adapt to the comprehension of the young, has become weakened, if not wholly invalidated, by the recent theory of Evolution.

According to this theory, now accepted by most philosophers, being powerfully supported by well-established facts of science, the Earth and its contents did not come into their present state of existence by a series of separate and distinct, or, so to speak, arbitrary acts of creation, by so many fits and starts of creative energy, but are the results of certain natural forces, acting upon matter according to fixed laws, causing gradual changes and developments in living things, and, by slow degrees, during the course of countless ages, transforming the simplest into the most complex

¹ Paley is by no means original in his "Argument from Design." Cicero stated the argument in these words: "Whoever thinks that the wonderful order and incredible constancy of the heavenly bodies are not governed by an Intelligent Being, is himself void of understanding. For shall we, when we see an artificial machine, a sphere or a dial, acknowledge at first sight that it is a work of art and understanding, and make any doubt that the heavens are the work not only of reason, but of an Excellent and Divine Reason?"—*De Natura Deorum*, II. 38.

² Part I. chap. i.

and varying forms of life, till the present climax was reached; and that climax itself no final climax, but itself, like many that preceded it, a starting point for a gradual decline of some, and for an equally gradual higher development of other forms of life.

If this theory be true, "every organic being has a place in a chain of events. It is not an isolated, a capricious fact, but an unavoidable phenomenon. It has its place in that vast, orderly concourse which has successively risen in the past, has introduced the present, and is preparing the way for a predestined future. From point to point in this vast progression, there has been a gradual, a definite, a continuous unfolding, a resistless order of evolution. But in the midst of these mighty changes stand forth immutable the laws that are dominating over all."¹

But if this theory of Evolution be true, if a slow and gradual transformation from one living form to another—a transformation obedient to fixed law—is, in our belief or mental vision, to take the place of that sudden calling forth of life, which we have hitherto associated with the idea of Creation, what, it is asked, becomes of the "Argument from Design"? Can a living thing be said to have been designed, if it arose in the ordinary course of events, if its coming into life was not only not specially designed, but was even an unavoidable event?

I would answer, that the "Argument from Design" is vastly intensified in force if the theory of Evolution be true. For if it be true, as the Evolutionists tell us, that all living creatures have gradually descended from a low organic form known as protoplasm, acted upon by forces which have ever remained subject to the same invariable laws, what must be said of the Origin of such protoplasm, such force, and such law, as could produce such results as the living creatures which

¹ Prof. Draper's "Conflict between Religion and Science."

people our world? Are not the marks of design all the more striking, if, with a foresight which the human mind can scarcely grasp or realise to the faintest degree, the matter, force, and law were so ordained, countless ages ago, as to produce, *without intervention in the interval* (as the Evolutionists would have us believe), a world teeming with all forms of life, as we see it now?

I would maintain, that if the doctrine of Evolution be true (and much yet remains to be proved before it can be regarded in any other light than that of a highly probable theory), the scheme of primal creation is thereby immeasurably ennobled, that the presence of Design is *ipso facto* proved—design of a kind so far-sighted, so multifarious, so full of numberless nascent and unborn conditions of life, each productive of countless forms of life, actual and potential, that the mind, contemplating the huge gap between the protoplasmic form and the complex vertebrates of to-day, quails beneath the burden of the developmental idea; and we feel that language is poor and weak, nay, powerless, since DESIGN is the strongest word we have to cover the far-sighted Creative Intention, which started into life a world of germs, that, after countless ages, could produce the wondrous world of life now surrounding us!¹

¹ Darwin concludes his "Origin of Species" with these words: "There is a grandeur in this view of life with its several powers having been originally breathed by the Creator into a few forms or into one; and that, while this planet has gone cycling on according to the fixed law of gravity, from so simple a beginning, endless forms most beautiful and most wonderful have been, and are being, evolved."

It is remarked by Sir John B. Byles ("Foundations of Religion," page 26) that, in the latter part of Voltaire's life, the argument from design was that which most impressed the philosopher, and seems to have removed from his mind not only all doubt, but all fear of ever doubting again: "J'admets cette Intelligence Suprême, sans craindre que jamais on puisse me faire changer d'opinion. Rien n'ébranle en moi cet axiome—tout ouvrage démontre un ouvrier."

APPENDIX II

LIMITS OF FAITH AND INQUIRY¹

FAITH, *but not credulity*. Where shall we draw the line between the two? Where does faith leave off and credulity begin? What shall he that has faith believe, and what shall he discredit? When shall Reason bend its head to Faith, and how shall it, without abdicating its sway? These are questions which affect every religion, and ours perhaps more closely than any, because our religion can afford inquiry.

Let us, then, attempt to define the limits, on the one hand, beyond which no religion should claim our belief; and, on the other hand, the limits beyond which no logic should dare to tread.

No religion should tax our faith to such an extent as to ask us to believe in an incongruity. Any religion that would tell us that, by one of its miracles, a part became greater than the whole, or that two and two made five, or that a thing was right and wrong at the same time, or that past time would come back again, would be wholly unworthy of belief; for such statements would involve moral impossibilities, incongruities, contradictions in terms.

But perhaps the reader may ask why we take such pains to demonstrate what every rational person must see to be a truism. We shall show that we are not contending with a mere shadow.

There is a religion which represents that there is a

¹ Reprinted, with alterations, from "Sabbath Readings."

Deity, consisting of three distinct personages acting independently of each other, but yet forming one Deity, one and indivisible. Of course, any rational man would say that a being cannot be *one* being and *three* beings at the same time; that if a being be indivisible, it cannot consist of three independent parts; that the whole theory is a contradiction in terms.

But those who profess the creed which propounds this remarkable doctrine tell us, in reply, that we cannot reason upon such a matter, and that men only require faith to believe in it.

We answer that though credulity can make a man believe a contradiction in terms, faith cannot; faith is the credit which the mind lends willingly to *that which has been tested and found trustworthy*; while credulity is the blind surrender of mind and reason to the untried scheme, or dreamy phantasy, or senseless theory, or cloudy mystery.

Why does the child have faith in his parents, and believe what they tell him? Because he has had experience of their kindness and of their love. He trusts them because he always finds them true to him. Childlike faith is not a blind faith, as some would maintain. It is a faith born of experience; and it is the stronger, the stronger its origin.

When Abraham left his native land, his kindred, and his father's house, at the bidding of God, was it blind faith that dictated obedience? Was it not rather the strong belief in the mission that was before him, the strong abhorrence of the idolatry of Haran, the strong confidence in the God who had saved him from the flames of the fire-worshippers, that made him believe in the Lord, so that "it was accounted to him for righteousness"? His faith was not blind credulity. It was *belief*, the offspring of experience. It had fed

on the broad pastures of reason, and drunk from the deep wells of thought.

And even with Abraham, the father of the faithful, faith required to be fed and nursed. "Lord God," he exclaimed, when he had been told that his seed would possess the land of Canaan, "whereby shall I know that I shall inherit it?" and God solved his doubts in a vision. Later yet, when a son was promised to him in his old age, he fell upon his face and laughed, and his wife exclaimed, "Shall I of a surety bear a child?" scarcely believing such an improbable event. God asks him, "Is anything too hard for the Lord?" And, still later, when he feared lest with the sinners of Sodom his kinsman Lot might be destroyed, and seemed to question the Divine justice in the words, "Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?" he shows that his faith even then was not quite complete.

But when the promise is fulfilled, and in his old age the longed-for son is born, and the prospect of a multitudinous progeny dawns upon him, we see a change. His faith is complete. Steadfast in that faith, he binds his son on Mount Moriah, for he knows that the command of the All-just, the All-merciful Ruler of the Universe must have been prompted by some wise and holy purpose.

Later yet, when he sends away his servant to seek a wife for his son from amongst his own kindred, he is confident that God will favour his mission; and, addressing the trusty Eleazar, he says, "The Lord God of Heaven, who took me from my father's house, and from the land of my kindred, and who spake unto me and swore unto me, saying, Unto thy seed will I give this land, He shall send His angel before thee." Abraham's faith is perfect. It had grown with a natural growth; experience had strengthened it; and, in his old age, his faith in God was ripe.

Let us now turn from the early Pentateuch history to the Mosaic Code itself, and we shall there see that the same standard of experience is set up as the only trustworthy basis of belief. Moses points out to the people in the following words the test whereby the false prophet may be detected: "When a prophet speaketh in the name of the Lord, if the thing follow not, nor come to pass, that is the thing which the Lord hath not spoken, but the prophet hath spoken it presumptuously."¹ Belief in a prophet was not to be that mere mental effort which some call faith; it was to be founded upon some fact within the experience of the believer.

But though the revelations of prophecy are to be thus tested by evidence and experience, we are not to allow ourselves to be led away to believe in that which is repugnant to reason, and at variance with the divine command. We are told,² "If there arise among you a prophet or a dreamer of dreams, and he giveth thee a sign or a wonder, and the sign or the wonder come to pass whereof he spake unto thee saying, Let us go after other gods which thou hast not known, and let us serve them, thou shalt not hearken unto the words of that prophet or that dreamer of dreams, for the Lord your God proveth you to know whether ye love the Lord your God with all your heart and with all your soul."³

The fulfilment of the prophecy or portent, then, is not to be the only test. There may be jugglery or chicanery; even the prophecy may verily be fulfilled, or the sign and the wonder may truly take place; but if the prophet bring a strange religion "which thou hast not known," a religion full of mystery and incon-

¹ Deut. xviii. 22.

² Deut. xiii. 1-3.

³ The line of argument and biblical illustrations here given are to a certain extent coincident with those in Chapter xiv. But it is thought desirable not to omit them in this reprint.

gruity, a religion inconsistent with the behests of God, such a prophet is not to be believed.

No matter, then, if at the foundation of a new creed its exponent or prophet gave signs and wonders which came to pass. Even assuming (which we do not grant) that those alleged miracles were historically true, we should not be justified in obeying him, when he bids us "follow after other gods," whom we neither know nor comprehend.

That God, who is unchangeable, did not, through Moses, in one day make a covenant with His people, and through that people with the whole earth, revealing His will, His behests, and His attributes, to abrogate and repeal that covenant on another day; substituting for a clear, simple, and comprehensible religion, a religion which is all mystery, all incongruity, credible only by excessive credulity. The revelation was not given to be revoked by a new covenant at a future epoch of the world's history. True, it did not reveal everything to our finite senses. It did not solve at once every problem in nature, for "the secret things belong to the Lord our God"; but those things which it did reveal are the eternal heritage of our race; they are clear, credible, comprehensible, even to our children; they "belong to us and to our children for ever, that we may do all the words of God's Law."¹

Thus far we have endeavoured to define the limits beyond which no religion should claim our belief. Let us now seek to discover the limits beyond which no reasoning should dare to tread.

When and where is Reason to stand still, and hand us over to the guardianship of Faith? Logic must not travel alone into the regions of the unseen, the illimitable, the eternal. In matters of religion, logic may deal only with what we see, and feel, and know, found-

¹ Deut. xxix. 29.

ing all its reasonings upon axioms known and indisputable. Nor may we in our thoughts and reasonings about God, His ways and works, judge of Him and them by our own petty human standard; "for My thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways My ways, saith the Lord."¹

Nor may we waste our mental energies in vain attempts to reconcile conflicting points, which in this life never will be reconciled.² What is the use, or where our right, to seek to reconcile the foreknowledge of God with the free-will of man, or any other such conflicting questions? What right have we to institute a suit between the two, and then to seek in vain to reconcile the suitors?

Predestination and free-will! Free-will we *think* we understand; but when we trace volition to the brain, and ask how free-will acts, all certain knowledge ends. We know the brain gives impulse to the nerves and muscles; but how, in what manner, no mind can comprehend. We *think* we have free-will; but find volition modified by circumstance of time and place, weather, health, and fancy, and a thousand trifles which we would scarcely own.

Predestination! What mind can fathom to its depth the meaning of Divine foreknowledge, defining that one word Omniscience? Omniscience! knowledge of all events to all eternity, knowledge, too, extending back, and back, and back to that eternity, which is past and gone! Whose mind can grasp this one idea, even the shadow of omniscience? And yet men talk so glibly of predestination and free-will, and seek to reconcile the two!

¹ Isa. lv. 8.

² "Man is not born to solve the problems of the Universe, but to find out where the problem begins, and then to restrain himself within the limits of the comprehensible. His faculties are not sufficient to measure the activities of the universe; and an attempt to explain the outer world by reason, from his narrow point of view, is a vain endeavour."—*Goethe*.

On the fatal rock of attempted reconciliation, many have wrecked their faith. The busy brains of shallow reasoners work hard to reconcile. They twist and turn the facts, distorting truth, till truth appears a falsehood. To their shallow minds all is beautifully reconciled and deftly fitted; but thoughtful men are not so satisfied. They see religionists build up religion on shifty quicksands of specious quibbles. "Is this religion?" they ask; and their questions end in doubts, their doubts in unbelief.

A sad result. Not that we must therefore suppress reason and underrate its powers. But reason must not proudly rear its head, and deem itself antagonist to faith. It is in truth a marvel. In all nature, reason has no parallel; and yet the mightiest effort of the greatest human mind must be of petty insignificance in the sight of Him who rules all mind and matter. Perhaps the infant's soul in heaven knows more than Newton ever knew on earth; perchance, transplanted to the realms above, the idiot's soul set free, may look down upon the master-work of master-minds on earth; and in its high pre-eminence of thought, may scorn to laugh at those small minds which laughed to scorn his own.

Such thoughts as these should check our small conceits, our overweening pride of reason which would weigh all things in the balance of logic, and seek to make religion, virtue, and futurity demonstrable like Euclid's elements. There must be a point where reason must bend its head to faith, and bid it take up the thread of a half-finished argument.¹

Reason shows us not infallibly the aim and end of life and living things. The great problem—why do we live and die?—reason will never solve with cer-

¹ "A man who would be all head is as great a monster as he who would be all heart. The wholly sound man is both."—*Herder*.

tainty. All it can do is to lead us to surmises from known facts and ascertained analogies ; to prove to us what we all feel true without such proof : that there is a God, and that that God is good and works for our good. Then faith, not credulous and blind belief, but faith built upon the sure foundation of experience of God's mercies, tells us all the rest ; tells us of the future we all hope to gain, and of the immortality we all hope to inherit.

Here Reason bends its head to Faith without abdicating its sway. It says, "So far, no farther can I guide you. Those dizzy heights of future, that dark abyss of past, no human mind can penetrate. Eternity, infinity, omnipotence, are only *words* to men. Through those broad plains of the illimitable ask me not to lead you. But you may read the future from the past. The sun which rose to-day will rise again to-morrow ; and so the God who always has been good, tender, and loving to His creatures, will be the same to you for ever. Act well and righteously, and await the end with trustful, loving faith."

Wise men will learn to wait. We have not long to wait. It needs no mighty strain on faith to feel and know that when the soul returns to Him from whom it came, all problems will be solved, all doubts removed without the adventitious aid of those misguided and misguiding folks who seek to reconcile.

Till then let Truth remain. Seek not to hide the fact. You cannot stay the progress of discovery, nor put a skid upon the wheels of science ; and even if you could, the *truth* would yet remain. The truth is our heritage. The "things which are revealed belong to us, and to our children for ever."

APPENDIX III

THE TITHE¹

“Will a man rob God? Yet ye have robbed Me. But ye say, Wherein have we robbed Thee? In tithes and offerings” (Mal. iii. 8).

THERE is this remarkable inconsistency in the practice of our religion, that while some of the Divine Commands are most scrupulously obeyed, others are totally neglected and ignored.

No more flagrant example of a neglected precept could be adduced than the law of Tithe. We have no excuse for forgetting it, for we read it in our synagogues three times a year; the precept is enjoined over and over again in the most solemn terms, and the prophets denounce those who neglect this command. And yet how few, nowadays, give tithe? Indeed, many who read this will be startled at hearing that it is at all a religious duty; a few may have heard of tithe as some sort of a burden on property like a rate or a tax; but most will think it some old and obsolete custom, belonging to an age long passed away; while some really pious people will complacently persuade themselves that it may be neglected with impunity now, since we are exiles from the Holy Land.

The words of the prophet quoted as a text will show in a sufficiently strong light the nature of the obligation involved in this important law. In Israel's palmy days, the tithes took the place of rates and taxes. Every one was bound to bring the tenth of his

¹ Reprinted from “Sabbath Readings.”

produce for the support of those who had no means—the Levites (who had no inheritance) and the poor. The first poor-law was made at Sinai, and an assessment was made then and for all time. It declared, “At the end of three years, thou shalt bring forth all the tithe of thine increase the same year, and shalt lay it up within thy gates. And the Levite (because he hath no part nor inheritance with thee), and the stranger, and the fatherless, and the widow, which are within thy gates, shall come and shall eat and be satisfied.”¹

In those days, there was no workhouse ; but poverty, as well as property, had its rights. The poor had the right to live, not by starvation doles, which make life only a lingering death, but by the open-handed gift of sufficient charity. The poor-law of Sinai proclaimed : “The poor shall never cease out of the land, therefore, I command thee saying, ‘Thou shalt open thine hand wide unto thy brother, to thy poor, and to thy needy, in thy land.’”²

But the institution of the Tithe possesses even a more remote antiquity than the Mosaic Code. We find that Abraham gave Melchizedek, the king-priest, tithe of all he possessed,³ and that Jacob, in his prayer at Bethel, promised God, “Of all that Thou givest me, I will surely give the tenth to Thee.”⁴ In those early days there was no sacrificial system requiring support, nor was there any elaborate state-establishment needing maintenance ; so the tithe given by the patriarchs must have been bestowed on the poor alone.

The Mosaic law of tithe, however, was of a three-fold character. One tithe was devoted to the service of the tabernacle or temple, and was given to the Priests and Levites for the maintenance of the state-establishment. It comprised “the tithe of the land,

¹ Deut. xiv. 28, 29.

³ Gen. xiv. 20.

² Deut. xv. 11.

⁴ Gen. xxviii. 22.

whether of the seed of the land or of the fruit of the tree, the tithe of the herd or of the flock,"¹ and this tithe was declared "holy unto the Lord."

Then, there was the yearly tithe of which the giver was also the recipient. We read in Deut. xiv. 22, 23: "Thou shalt truly tithe all the increase of thy seed, that the field bringeth forth year by year," "the tithe of thy corn, of thy wine and thine oil, and the firstlings of thy herds and of thy flocks." This tithe was not to be given away; but every man had to take it to Jerusalem, and was there to eat it, "that thou mayest learn to fear the Lord thy God always." Or, if he lived at a distance from the Holy City, he was told to carry thither the money-value of the tithe, and to expend it for whatsoever his soul lusted after, and he was to eat this before the Lord God, and rejoice, he and his household. This tithe made Jerusalem not only a great religious centre, but also an important commercial centre; for one tenth of the whole produce of Palestine had thus to be brought to the Holy City, and was either there consumed, or it changed hands in the ordinary course of commerce; and the Israelite was thus taught to spiritualise his worldly prosperity and enjoyments, by eating the tithe of his produce "before the Lord."

Lastly, there was the tithe of the third year. Every third year the Israelite had to bring forth the tenth part of his profits, and in that same year to lay it up in reserve for the service of the poor. "At the end of three years thou shalt bring forth all the tithe of thine increase the same year, and shalt lay it up within thy gates: And the Levite (because he hath no part or inheritance with thee), and the stranger and the fatherless and the widow which are within thy gates shall come and shall eat and be satisfied; that the

¹ Lev. xxvii. 30, 32.

Lord thy God may bless thee in all the work of thine hand which thou doest.”¹

In that remarkable book of the Apocrypha, Tobit, we find the three tithes thus practically described: “The first tenth part of all increase I gave to the sons of Aaron, another tenth part I sold away, and went and spent it every year at Jerusalem, and the third I gave unto them it was meet.”²

Our Ritual Code, too, in distinct terms, enacts the law of tithe, declaring that “a man should give in charity at least one tenth of his income.”³

As we have no longer Priests, nor Levites, nor sacrifices, we cannot bring the first tithe. As we have no Jerusalem, wherein we can rejoice before the Lord, we cannot bring the second tithe. But the privilege of the third tithe, the tithe of the third year, the tithe of the poor, yet remains to us, and it is with this command that we are at present chiefly concerned.

The tithe of the third year was to be brought by every Israelite, and laid up within the gates of his city. It was to be a reserve fund, on which the needy were to draw as occasion required. All who were in distress, the stranger, the widow, and the orphan, were to partake of its bounty, and “eat and be satisfied.” There were storehouses for the tithe, and we find that there were times when it was collected in such abundance that even a special organisation was needed for its distribution.⁴

And when it was duly stored, each man bringing tithe made a solemn declaration before God that he had truly assessed his profit, and had given the exact tenth to the poor, and he craved the blessing of the Almighty as a reward for his faithful stewardship.

The Bible, and especially the Pentateuch, is very

¹ Deut. xiv. 28, 29. ² Tobit i. 7. ³ Yore Deah, 249, § 1.

⁴ 2 Chron. xxxi. 5, 6, 12; Neh. xiii. 12.

sparing in imposing prayer-formulas ; but, with regard to the tithe, the Law prescribes a special prayer to accompany it, so lending to the observance a significance sufficiently indicative of its importance. And this is the prayer : " I have brought away the hallowed things out of mine house, and also have given them to the Levite, and unto the stranger, to the fatherless and to the widow, according to all the commandments which Thou hast given me. Neither have I transgressed Thy commandments, neither have I forgotten them. I have not eaten thereof in my mourning, neither have I taken away aught thereof for any unclean use, nor given aught thereof for the dead ; but I have hearkened to the voice of the Lord my God, and have done according to all that Thou hast commanded me. Look down from Thy holy habitation, from heaven, and bless Thy people Israel, and the land which Thou hast given us, as Thou swarest unto our fathers, a land that floweth with milk and honey." ¹ No more powerful declaration could be imagined than that contained in this prayer. It says in plain language : " Inasmuch as I have fulfilled Thy command by giving truly tithe to the poor, so fulfil Thy gracious promise, and grant us the blessing of plenty ! "

How the blessing was fulfilled, all readers of Sacred History know well. Difficult though it may be for the modern traveller to conceive the present arid plains and rocky crags of Palestine ever to have been otherwise than they now are, we all know that in the days of Israel's greatness the Holy Land was truly a land flowing with milk and honey. But it was the tithe that brought the blessing. " Bring ye all the tithes into the storehouse," said the prophet Malachi, " that there may be meat in Mine house, and prove me now herewith, saith the Lord of Hosts, if I will not open

¹ Deut. xxvi. 13, 14, 15.

you the windows of Heaven, and pour you out a blessing, that there shall not be room enough to receive it.”¹

In these days of materialism and infidelity, people find it difficult to realise any connection between the giving of tithe and a good harvest; and these words of the prophet, if spoken now, would probably fall on deaf ears. But the same prophet spoke those startling words which we have cited as our text, and they possess a force even greater than the promise of a miraculous harvest. For they appeal to our sense of honour. We all pride ourselves on our sense of honour. The idea of robbing any one is repugnant to every right-minded man. Who would think of robbing even his enemy? Who would dream of robbing his best friend? Then “shall a man rob God?” Yet, says God, “ye have robbed Me, in the tithes and offerings.”

If we could but appreciate the full purport of this imputation—an imputation which holds good against many, nay, most of us, in these our times—how different would be the standard of our liberality to the poor, and how different would be the condition of suffering humanity! To God we owe all we have, be it much or little. He gives it to us with generous hand, but bids us return Him one tenth, only one tenth, for His poor, for the widow, the orphan, and the stranger: and yet that small tenth we withhold from Him! Shall a man rob God? Yet we do rob Him when, instead of giving, freely and fully, the fair tithe of our income, we bestow our niggardly gifts on the poor, and call that charity.

There is much cant abroad in our times, and there is no more rampant specimen of this cant than the cant of social economists, with reference to the question of charity. They would organise charity to such

¹ Mal. iii. 10.

refined perfection that, in the end, there would be no occasion to give, for there would be no one to receive. They would only give to the "deserving poor," to those who can help themselves. All other gifts would be contrary to the rules of social economy; and God forbid that, in helping the poor, they should break the laws of supply and demand! They would stamp out pauperism by stamping out the poor. That one and the same poor man should receive a little aid from two sources, is hateful to their souls; that two charities should do like work, like two rivers running in parallel courses and fertilising the same soil, is sacrilege in their sight. They are charitable, but their charity is an abstract idea, and it is so much cheaper to talk charity than to practise it.

But, as our religion is the religion of action, so is our charity the charity of action; and the dreams of sociologists will never stamp out pauperism, nor stem the overflowing tide of poverty. The true cause of chronic pauperism is the insufficiency of our charitable aid. It is said there are too many charities, and too little organisation. We would reply, there is too little charity, and nothing to organise. The first condition of organisation is, that there must be enough subject-matter to organise.

What is our charity? The small doles received by our poor are barely enough to meet their pressing necessities, to ward off for the moment the pangs of hunger or of cold; and who can evoke in them prudence for to-morrow, when they have not even the bread of to-day? Who can arouse a spirit of self-reliant hope in the starving soul, or incite to industry and action the ill-nourished, attenuated frame? The small dole pauperises, because it is a hand-to-mouth relief; the large gift founds new hope, starts new efforts, new activity, new industry, new work.

It gives the poor man a to-morrow; it revives his strength for a fresh start, for a new struggle, to wipe out past sufferings, humiliations, and despair.

But whence are to be obtained the means for these large gifts? How find the capital for the poor, small though it be for each, out of the niggardly income of our charities? It can never be done, and the poor can never be adequately, successfully, and permanently relieved, while men give as they now give, fitfully, sparingly, grudgingly; never till men give the full tithe of their income to works of benevolence. Then there will be enough, and to spare; and charitable relief will mean not a mere stop-gap, but a permanent benefit to the large majority of the relieved. True, even unlimited means cannot insure invariable success, and the poor will never entirely cease out of the land; but miseries can be alleviated, and the helpful can be helped, and the falling aided before they have fallen, if only adequate means be at hand.

We Jews pride ourselves on our charity; and, perhaps, compared with our neighbours, we are charitable indeed. But even our standard is low, miserably low, compared with that which our Divine Law has ordained for us, the standard of the Tithe. We give fitfully, without system, without principle; we give as creatures of impulse. Charity should be a deliberate act, and it can only become such by our devoting thereto a fixed proportion of our means.

It must not be imagined that the law of Tithe applies only to the opulent. It applies to all classes. Even the poor Levite who had no inheritance in Israel had to bring a tithe of his tithe.¹ And so the poor, when they made a profit, were expected to devote the due proportion to works of benevolence. "If thou hast abundance, give alms accordingly; if thou hast

¹ Num. xviii. 26.

but little, be not afraid to give according to that little." ¹ The same God, who ordained the tithe, promised a certain reward—even a material reward—for the fulfilment of this command; and surely no one with a spark of religion will doubt the Divine Will or Divine Power so to reward the trustful poor, who give from their scanty resources, already burdened by their own needs. These—the alms eked out from daily necessities—make charity the highest of virtues. These, though they may be but crumbs compared with the rich man's gifts, are more precious than showers of gold cast off from the superfluities of wealth. Probably with us Jews, the poor give tithe more often than do the rich; for among the less fortunate of our brethren, nothing is more frequent than to find poverty aiding a greater poverty, forgetting self in ministering to the sufferings of others.

The poor helping the poor is truly a sight that imparts a halo of romance even to sordid poverty. For who can look upon such acts of self-denial without a thankful recognition of the divine power of pity and love, implanted in the human breast, making every man, however humble, an angel—a messenger of God—to him he succours?

We live in dangerous times—dangerous because education is becoming general, and education makes men think; and thinking men ask, wherefore those frightful social contrasts which civilised life presents—the contrasts between the two extremes of wealth and indigence? Wherefore the contrast between the multitude, who live a struggling, starving life, and the few, who live a useless, aimless, luxurious life, embarrassed with riches that they know not how to spend? For who can look beneath the thin film of that skin-deep civilisation which modern society pre-

¹ Tobit iv. 8.

sents, and not be appalled at the seething mass of poverty, suffering, and wretchedness, which seems ready to break the bounds of law, like lava bursting the volcano's crust ?

Heaven has ordained that there must ever be rich and poor, master and servant, and all those grades of social rank which wealth creates. But Heaven never ordained poverty to be hopeless, chronic, and without remedy, nor meant it to be, as it is to thousands, another name for death. The rich were to help the poor, help them wisely, tenderly, sufficiently—not with the niggard hand that drops a stray copper to the starving wretch, who roams about the streets weak with hunger ; nor with the half-grudged guineas, given by hard persuasion, to ill-supported charities, which leave their work undone, ill-done, half-done, for want of means—but with the systematic share, well and truly meted, of the wealth that God has given.

And if this sacred duty were honourably fulfilled by all, how different would be the world ! We should not find those shocking scenes of poverty that assail the senses in every great city ; those hideous hovels, reeking with filth and squalor, that constitute the poor man's home ; nor the pale, emaciated forms of children, old in their early youth from want of sustenance ; nor the gaunt, white spectres of men and women, wan with want and suffering, pinched and withered in the struggle for their daily bread. From those murky social swamps, where the poor wither and die before their time, springs the will-o'-the-wisp of communism, and those other godless pestilential creeds, which threaten society. In its own defence society should help the poor. It cannot last long with such contrasts as it now presents.

And in so many ways can the poor be helped, not merely helped but raised, if only there were forth-

coming sufficient means and earnest workers, and if to each worker were apportioned his fair share of the gigantic task. Then, indeed, would wealth be adorned and glorified; for the rich would have the glorious work of raising the indigent from the deep abyss of suffering and sorrow—a mission worthy of angels.

To all of us, soon or late, the time must come when this world and all its charms and blandishments will fade away from our gaze, and all our worldly hopes and aims and ends, all our ambitions, will be as nought. Nothing then will seem or be to us of value, save the small handful of godly goodly works, that we have wrought for others. In that supreme hour, how poor may be the rich, how rich the poor!

Whatever be our means, great or small, in that dread hour our wealth will be what we ourselves have stored in works of goodness, kindness, mercy to others; they will be our riches, for no other coin is current before the Throne of Mercy but deeds of mercy. To the merciful, God will show Himself Merciful.¹

At such an hour, would you have it forced on your unwilling, but too vivid, memory, that you have fallen short of your duty to the poor, that you have withheld from them their fair share of God's great bounty to yourself, that you have robbed the widow and orphan of their due, that you have withheld from God his tithe?

Then, while you have life and health and means, give—give to God the tithe which is His; for the sake of the poor, that they may live; for the sake of society, that it may endure; for your own sake, that the work of your hands may be blessed; for the sake of duty, honesty, and honour!

For “shall a man rob God”?

¹ Ps. xviii. 25.

APPENDIX IV

THE SANHEDRIN, AND THE ORIGIN OF THE TALMUD¹

WE have already seen² how, at the instance of Jethro, the first local Israelitish courts of justice were established by the appointment of "rulers of thousands, rulers of hundreds, rulers of fifties, and rulers of tens," who "judged the people at all seasons." But the Supreme Court, which, later in Jewish history, acquired the Greek name *Sanhedrin*, is said to have had its origin in the events related in the eleventh chapter of Numbers.

"And the Lord said unto Moses, Gather unto Me seventy men of the elders of Israel, whom thou knowest to be the elders of the people, and officers over them; and bring them unto the Tent of Meeting, that they may stand there with thee. And I will come down, and talk with thee there; and I will take of the spirit which is upon thee, and will put it upon them; and they shall bear the burden of the people with thee, that thou bear it not thyself alone."³

Moses found the task of governing and controlling the people too burdensome for him. He was accordingly directed to associate with him seventy elders, to share with him the burden of the people. The Bible does not tell us clearly how the selection was made; but tradition tells us that it was made in this fashion:

¹ Much of the material for this Appendix was kindly supplied for the original edition by the Rev. Dr. Hermann Adler, the present Chief Rabbi.

² Page 171.

³ Num. xi. 16, 17.

Six candidates, known for their prudence and worth, were selected from each tribe, thus making seventy-two, or two in excess of the required number. Seventy pieces of parchment were marked with a certain sign, and two pieces were left blank. The seventy-two then drew lots. Eldad and Medad are supposed to have been the two who drew blanks, and their peculiar position is described in a later part of the same chapter.¹ The remaining seventy were duly installed, "and when the spirit rested upon them, they prophesied."

The functions of the august assembly thus constituted were, the maintenance of order and the instruction of the people, more especially the solution of difficult points of law, beyond the powers of the tribal or local courts; and thus appears to have originated an institution which, in later times, exercised the greatest influence upon the development of Judaism—the Sanhedrin.

In post-biblical history, the Great Sanhedrin is constantly mentioned as a body which constituted a common centre of religious authority to all the children of Israel, throughout their dispersion. Much has been written on the subject. An Englishman, John Selden, who lived in the reign of Charles I., wrote a Dissertation in Latin, entitled *De Synedriis et Præfecturis Juridicis veterum Ebræorum*. An elaborate Treatise on the subject has been published by Dr. Hoffmann, entitled *Der oberste Gerichtshof in der Stadt des Heiligthums*. Some scholars suppose that this great council did not arise until the days of Ezra, and that it was a new institution devised by this sage. But the weight of probability is against this view. It is not likely that the council of seventy elders, established by Moses, should have been merely a temporary tribunal. There had been previously a temporary

¹ Num. xi. 26-29.

appointment of elders, who, together with Aaron and Hur, were to rule the people, while Moses was absent for forty days on the mount of God,¹ but, judging from the sequel—the history of the worship of the golden calf—these delegates could have had little influence over the people. The spirit of Moses was not upon them.

But with the tribunal of Seventy ordained in the eleventh chapter of Numbers it was far different. Moses had been so wearied by the strain of his burden, that he had begged God to take his life rather than permit him to continue in his wretchedness.² No temporary appointment would have given to Moses the necessary relief. It is not credible that the transfer of the spirit of the great Legislator to the Seventy Elders would have been effected as a mere temporary expedient, and the Bible does not mention any special exigency needing the special and temporary work of the Elders. Indeed, the whole language of the text indicates the permanency of the institution. "When the spirit rested upon them, they prophesied, and did not cease."³

It is true that we do not find the Tribunal of Seventy again referred to in the Pentateuch in distinct terms; but such an omission would be quite in accordance with the biblical style of narrative, which, while most explicit in some passages, contents itself with mere hints and allusions in others. Thus, when we find in the narrative of the rebellion of Korah, that the elders of Israel followed Moses,⁴ there can be no doubt that reference is made to the Council of Seventy, who aided him in communicating to the people the Divine behest. Again, in the twenty-seventh chapter of Deuteronomy, where we find⁵ that Moses with the Elders of Israel charged the people to keep the commandments, it was

¹ Exod. xxiv. 1-14.

² Num. xi. 15.

³ Num. xi. 25.

⁴ Num. xvi. 25.

⁵ Deut. xxvii. 1.

doubtless again the Council of Seventy who acted as assessors to the great Legislator. We again meet with allusions to the Elders in the time of Joshua and the Judges, and we may readily understand that if Moses had needed the support of a tribunal to share with him the duties and responsibilities of government, his successors would still more urgently need such aid.

It is probable that the Tribunal of Seventy fell into abeyance during the reign of some of the Kings, who desired to rule despotically, unchecked by representatives of legally constituted authority. But there can be no doubt that King Jehoshaphat strove to re-organise it, for we are told,¹ "Moreover in Jerusalem did Jehoshaphat set of the Levites and of the priests, and of the chief of the fathers of Israel, for the judgment of the Lord, and for controversies," and he appears to have imparted to the tribunal a twofold character, by appointing two presidents, one, the high-priest, for religious matters, and the other the ruler of the house of Judah for civil causes.

When our fathers returned from the Babylonian captivity, the Institution was revived by Ezra, the Seventy Elders in all probability forming a part of the "men of the Great Synagogue."² But it is at the time of the Maccabees that we find the Tribunal of Seventy flourishing in all its vigour, as the Supreme Council of State. It is mentioned in all the most important State documents. Thus, when Jonathan makes a league with the Lacedæmonians, he writes: "Jonathan the High Priest and the Elders of the nation, and the priests and the other people of the Jews unto the Lacedæmonians, their brethren, send greeting."³

¹ 2 Chron. xix. 8.

² These were 120 in number, and were the first compilers of a Jewish liturgy, on which our present prayer-book is based.

³ 1 Macc. xii. 6.

The Talmud gives full particulars of the mode in which members of the Sanhedrin were appointed, and as to the functions the tribunal had to fulfil. The tribunal was originally called *Beth-din haggadol* (בֵּית דִּין הַגָּדוֹל), "the Great House of Judgment," but it acquired the name Sanhedrin (סַנְהֶדְרִין) from the Greek *συνέδριον*, which simply means "assembly," at the time of the Macedonian supremacy, the senators of that state being called *συνέδροι* or assembly-men.

The Sanhedrin consisted of seventy members, besides the president, *Nassi* (נָשִׂיא), prince or patriarch; and thus it exactly corresponded with the Assembly in the Wilderness, which consisted of seventy Elders, with Moses as president. Each member of the Great Sanhedrin was called to his high office by ordination (סְמִיָּךְ) or imposition of hands, and this ceremony connected him, through a long chain of prophets and judges, with Joshua, whom Moses himself had ordained.

The members were selected, not from the privileged or wealthy classes, but exclusively from those who were distinguished for their personal worth and high attainments. The king was not eligible, lest his opinion, backed by his lofty authority, might carry too much weight. It is stated that the moral qualifications necessary for admission to the august assembly were wisdom, modesty, the fear of God, disinterestedness, the love of truth, humanity, and an unstained reputation. Moreover, the Israelite admitted to a seat in the Great Council was required to be profoundly versed in the Law, and was also obliged to show himself well acquainted with a wide range of studies not theological, such as astronomy, physics, and medicine. He had likewise to be a good linguist, so as to be able to understand evidence in foreign tongues without the aid of an interpreter, and he was also expected to be acquainted with the philosophies, opinions, practices,

and superstitions of the heathens. The High Priest himself could not *claim* to be a member of the Sanhedrin; but preference was given to him, as well as to the ordinary priests, if they possessed the necessary qualifications.

The *Nassi*, or president, was chosen entirely on account of his pre-eminent worth and wisdom. The senior member of the Seventy, called the *Ab Beth-din* (אב בית דין), "father of the house of judgment," sat at the right hand of the president, and the rest of the Seventy sat before them in the form of a semicircle.

The place where the sessions of the Sanhedrin were ordinarily held, was the *Lishchath Hagazith* (לשכת הגזית), a hall in one of the courts of the Temple.

The functions of the Tribunal were twofold, executive and legislative. It constituted the Supreme Court of Judicature, which tried all cases of national importance, such as cases of false prophets, a traitor high-priest, an idolatrous tribe or city, and, generally, all capital cases. It should be added that the Talmud distinctly asserts that the power of inflicting capital punishment was taken away from the Tribunal by the Romans forty years before the destruction of the Second Temple, and that it was only the Roman procurator who could confirm and execute the sentence of the Sanhedrin. This fact is an important one, as it rebuts the charge, which has been the cause of so much persecution, that the Jews crucified Jesus. He was certainly arraigned before the Sanhedrin as a false prophet, but the punishment was executed not by Jews, but by Romans, and according to Roman custom; for crucifixion was not one of the Jewish modes of capital punishment.

The legislative function of the Sanhedrin was derived from its judicial function. Like all supreme courts of appeal, it gradually built up a system of "case law"

upon the broad substructure of statute law; the statute law being, in the present instance, the Mosaic Code with its traditional interpretation. Deriving its authority from the precept in Deut. xvii. 8-10, to which we have already referred,¹ the Sanhedrin did not permit its system of "case law" to drift gradually into chaotic confusion, as is the custom in many modern communities, and notably in England; but, sitting permanently, it collected and collated ancient traditions, judgments, and decisions, gave coherence and system to them, and thus enabled many enactments of the Pentateuch, otherwise obscure, to be carried out in practical life.

These decisions were voluntarily accepted by the people. At first they were traditional, handed down from Sanhedrin to Sanhedrin, from teacher to pupil by word of mouth, codified, but not allowed to be reduced to writing, lest the traditional law which, in certain circumstances, could be modified by subsequent decisions, should be confounded with the immutable written law promulgated on Sinai. But later on, about 150 years after the destruction of the Second Temple, when the nation was dispersed in many countries, Rabbi Judah, the Prince, or the Holy, fearing that the traditions might be lost or forgotten amid the many trials to which our people were subjected, determined to reduce to writing the entire bulk of the traditional law, a work already commenced a century back by the disciples of the renowned Hillel. Aided by his sons Simon and Gamliel, and by other sages and scholars of his time, he accomplished this work, condensing the tradition into six divisions, which he styled the *Mishna* (מִשְׁנָה) (Learning).

The traditions once codified and reduced to writing, no new laws or decisions were permitted to be added

¹ Page 160, "Laws of Government."

to them. But, as time went on, the Mishna itself became a starting point and basis for further development and commentary; and, the two centuries succeeding its codification being a period of great mental activity among the remnant of our nation, an enormous mass of commentary was at length accumulated, which was, in course of time, collected by Rabina and Rab Ashi, and formed the work now known as the *Gemara* (גמרא), i.e. Tradition. The *Mishna* was completed about the year 200, the *Gemara* about the year 500 of the common era. These two works together constitute the *Talmud* (תלמוד), or Study of the Law.

There are two recensions of the Talmud—the Jerusalem and the Babylonian; the latter being the more comprehensive work, and that generally referred to when the term “Talmud” is used.

INDEX

	PAGE		PAGE
ABLUTIONS after Infec-		Balance of Power in	
tion	212	Nature	24
Abraham, Promise to . .	69	Battlements, Law of . .	161
" Revelation to	69	Beauty of the World . .	28
Abraham's Faith, Growth		Belief, the result of ex-	
of	276	perience	276
Adoration, Silent	191	Bible, The	65
" Adultery, Thou shalt		" and Immortality . .	245
not commit "	89	" how collated	65, 99
Aged, Respect for the . .	191	Birds allowed to be eaten	222
Ahab and Naboth	96	" prohibited as food . .	222
Ambition, Limits of . . .	97	Blessing of the Priests . .	115
Amulets	148	" Blind, A stumbling-	
<i>Amun-Ra</i> , The Ineffable	191	block before the " . . .	204
Animals allowed as food	219	Blood prohibited as food	219
" kindness to	207	how withdrawn	
" prohibited as		" from meat	221
food	221	" is life	220
Annihilation impossible .	248	" sacrifices	106, 109
" George Eliot	248	" to be poured on . . .	
on	248	the earth	220
Anniversaries	124, 226	Blood-eating animals pro-	
Antigonus on Disinte-		hibited as food	222
rested Work	254	" Book, The People of	
Antiochus Epiphanes . .	232	the "	103
<i>Arba Kanfoth</i>	150	Booths, Dwelling in . .	131
" Argument from De-		Boundary-marks, Re-	
sign "	1, 272	moval of	162
Asceticism	186	Browning on bargained	
Atonement, Day of . . .	140	Reward	254
" The Pro-		Byles, Sir J. B., on	
phets on	143	Prayer	118
Attributes of God	26, 38	CAPITAL and Labour,	
Authority, Respect for,		Conflict of	197
constituted	171	Capital Punishment . .	156
Avenger of Blood	159	Carlyle on Work	122
BACON, Lord, on Fear of		Carnivora prohibited as	
Death	249	food	222
" Proper notion of		Cattle, Jewish mode of	
the Deity	251	slaughtering	221

	PAGE		PAGE
Charity a habit	164	Death, Lord Bacon on	249
<i>Chel</i> , The, in the Temple	179	" Horace on Con-	
Cicero's "Argument from		templation of	238
Design"	272	" Longfellow on	249
Circumcision	145	" Lucretius on	249
Cities of Refuge	156	" Seneca on	250
City of the Dead, The		" Sherlock on Re-	
Egyptian	215	union after	250
Cloven-footed Ruminants	222	" Spinoza on Con-	
Commemorative Obser-		templation of	238
vances	226	Debt, Extinction of	165
Compensation for loss or		Dedication, Feast of	232
damage	160	Defilement and Purifica-	
Compensation for per-		tion	210
sonal injury	158	Design in Creation	3, 272
Concentrated wealth,		" Unity of	11
Prevention of	168	Devil, by whom invented	187
Confession	142	Dietary Laws, The	218
Corners of the field	165	" Moral influence of	224
Coroner's Jury, Presumed		" Sanitary influence	
origin of	161	of	222
Corpse-traffic of Egypt	214	Diseased Animals pro-	
Corpses regarded as un-		hibited as food	223
clean	213	Dishonest Trading	200
Cosmopolitanism of the		Disinterested Work	254
Mosaic Law	177	Dispersion, Apparent ob-	
Court of Gentiles in the		ject of Jewish	270
Temple	172	Distinctions, Outward	145
" of Justice, Su-		Draper, Prof., on Evolu-	
preme	173	tion	273
Courts, Local	173	EBERS on Egyptian Theft	92
"Covet, Thou shalt not"	95	Education, Laws relating	
Creative Design	3, 272	to	174
Credulity not a virtue	275	" in Egypt	176
Creed, Three Principles of		Egypt, Israelites in	126
the Jewish	80	Egyptian Priesthood	215
Crimes, Capital	156	" <i>post-mortem</i>	
Cruelty of ancient laws	102	trials	215
DARWIN on Grandeur of		" theft legalised	92
Evolution	274	" treatment of	
David's Covetousness	96	the dead	214
Dead, Consulting the	217	Eliot, George, on Im-	
" Egyptian treat-		mortal Life	248
ment of the	214	Employer and Employed	197
" Jewish treatment		Envy	95
of the	214	Esther, Book of	230
" Sacrificing to the	217	Esther's self-devotion	232
Deaf, Cursing the	204	Eternal punishment im-	
Death an incident of life	249	possible	188
" Fear of	249	Eternity and Life	237

INDEX

305

	PAGE		PAGE
Eternity of God	38	God, Immutability of . .	39
Evil, Existence of . . .	34	„ Incorporeality of . .	40
„ Probable reason for .	36	„ Omnipotence of . . .	42
Evolution and Design . .	272	„ Omniscience and . .	
Excrement, Disposal of .	213	„ Omnipresence of . . .	41
Existence of a God . . .	1	„ Unity of, proved . . .	
“ Eye for Eye ”	158	„ from Nature	11
		„ Unity of, declared . .	
FACE, The human	46	„ by Revelation	80
Faith a result of experi- .		God's representation of .	
ence	276	„ Himself	187
„ without credulity . .	275	„ proclamation of . . .	
Fasts and Feasts, His- .		„ His mercy	187, 252
torical	226	„ ways and thoughts . .	252
Fast of <i>Ab</i>	228	Goethe on “ Chance ” and	
„ Atonement	140	„ “ Accident ”	231
„ <i>Gedaliah</i>	228	„ on human limita-	
„ <i>Tamuz</i>	228	tions	231
„ <i>Tebeth</i>	228	Government, Laws of . .	170
Fat, certain kinds pro- .		„ Form of,	
hibited	223	„ optional	170
Fear of Death	249	Guardians of the Law, .	
Feast of <i>Hanucah</i>	232	The Jews	103
„ Passover	123	<i>Hagadah</i> , The	128
„ <i>Purim</i>	230	Hand, The, example of .	
„ Tabernacles	131	creative design	6
„ Weeks	128	<i>Hanucah</i> , Feast of	232
Fidelity, Conjugal . . .	89, 205	<i>Haphtarah</i> , Origin of . .	135
First-fruits, The	129	Happiness, Imperfection	
„ Prayer of the	130	of worldly	53
Fishes “ permitted to be		Happy, How to be	194
eaten	222	Happy Religion, Juda-	
Flesh and milk	223	ism a	185
Food, Laws relating to .	218	Hasmoneans, The	233
Foretaste of future re- .		Hebrew, Why we pray in	120
ward	253	Hell, How invented . . .	187
„ punishment	253	Herder on the History of	
Forgiveness, Duty of . .	205	Israel	236
Form, the human	47	Hillel and Shammai, . .	
Freedom, The Festival of	126	„ Story of	193
Freehold, Limitation of .	169	„ The disciples of . . .	300
Fringes, The	150	Historical Fasts and . .	
		Feasts	226
GEORGE ELIOT on Im- . .	248	History as a science . . .	230
mortal Life		„ vitiated	203
<i>Gemara</i> , The	301	Honesty and truth	89, 202
Gleaner's rights	165	Hooker on Silent Prayer	120
God, Attributes of . . .	11, 26, 38	Horace on man's “ last	
„ Eternity of	38	day ”	238
„ Goodness, Mercy, . .		House, The leprous . . .	211
and Wisdom of	26		

	PAGE		PAGE
IBN GABIROL, Solomon,		Judah, Rabbi, the Prince	300
on Prayer	116	Judaism a happy Religion	185
Idolatry, Evil results of .	63	Judges, Appointment of	
" Presumed origin		first	171
of	26	" Charge to the .	172
Immortality of Soul . 49,	238	" Duties of the .	172
" Bible hints on . . .	240	Just Balances	91, 199
" Ecclesiastes on . . .	247	Justice and Mercy not	
" Isaiah on	247	incompatible	252
" Longfellow on . . .	249		
" Pentateuch on . . .	238	KID in goat's-milk for-	
" Psalmist on	245	bidden	223
" revealed by Nature		" a modern oriental	
49,	248	delicacy	224
Immutability of God . . .	39	Kindness to animals . . .	207
Improvement, Duty of . .	139	" dependants . . .	197
Incongruous Miracles . .	275	" strangers	177
Incorporeality of God . .	40	King, Duties of the . . .	170
Infection, Treatment of . .	210	" Kingdom of Priests,"	
Inheritance, Laws of . . .	169	The	103
Injuries, Accidental per-			
sonal	160	LABOUR, a duty	84
" Intentional per-		Labour and Capital, Con-	
sonal	157	flict of	198
" Compensation		Land-Laws, The	168
for	160	Law, The Reign of	19, 273
" inflicted by		Law of Moses, how given .	99
cattle	160	Laws of antiquity cruel .	102
Inspiration and Revela-		Leprosy, Treatment of . .	211
tion	65	Leprous House, The . . .	211
" Modern	67	Lessing on the Immor-	
Interchange between ani-		tality Doctrine	244
mal, vegetable, and		Levites, The, as public	
mineral kingdom . . .	18	teachers	175
Isaiah on Sacrifice	111	Liberal Spirit of Judaism	181
Isaiah's Prophecies	262	Life a mere incident in	
Isolation of infectious		Eternity	249
diseases	210	" and Eternity . . .	237
Israelites, The, in Egypt .	126	" and Limb, Protec-	
Israel's Hope, Prophecy		tion of	156
and	255	" Contrivances of Na-	
JACOB's injunction as to		ture for protec-	
his Burial	216	tion of	8
Jeremiah on Sacrifice . .	111	" The future	237
Jeremiah's Prophecies . .	265	Limitations to right of	
Jerusalem, Destruction of	228	property	163
Johnson on Prayer	118	Limits of Faith and En-	
Joseph's injunction as to		quiry	275
his Burial	216	Loans without interest . .	165
Jubilee, The	168	Logic and Faith	275

INDEX

307

	PAGE		PAGE
Longfellow on Silent Prayer	119	Mordecai the Jew	232
" on Immortal Life	249	Moses in Egypt	72
Lost property, Laws as to	162	" Prophecies of	258
Love of God	184	" Sepulchre of, un- known	217
" Love thy neighbour as thyself"	193	Mummies	216
Lowell on Nobility of Soul	206	Murder, Trial for	157
Lucretius on the Fear of Death	249	Murdered person, Law as to discovery of	161
Lying	201	NAAMAN and Elisha	212
" Indirect	201	Nazirite, The	186
MACCABEES, The	232	New Year's Festival	137
Maimonides' view of Sacrifices	131	Noah, Food-laws given to Non-Israelites, Tolerance towards	218 179
" as to mixture of milk and flesh	224	OBSERVANCES of Fast of Atonement	141
Man and his position	45	" Feast of Taber- nacles	131
" an improving animal	48	" Feast of Weeks	128
" Pre-eminence of	45	" New Year's Day	137
" Reasoning powers of	47	" Passover	123
Manslaughter	160	" Sabbath	82, 122
Mattathias	233	Omar's threat at Ma- homet's death	217
Max Müller on Changes	174	Omer, Counting the	128
Mediator, A, superfluous	187	Omnipotence of God	42
Memorial, Day of	137	" Limits of	43
Mercy and Wisdom of God	26	Omnipresence of God	41
Mercy not incompatible with Justice	253	Omniscience	41
Messiah, The	264	Outward Distinctions	145
Mezzuzah	150	PALM-BRANCH, The (Lu- lab)	134
Micah on Sacrifice	112	Parents, Duty towards	87
Midrash on the Divine Mercy	251	" Education of chil- dren by their	175
Milk and flesh	223	" Respect of	191
" Seething a kid in	223	Parsees, The	62
Milton on the strength of weakness	236	Passover, Feast of	123
Mishna, The compilation of the	300	" Observances of	126
Mission of Judaism	74, 271	" Samaritan	127
Modesty, The duty of	205	Patriarchs, The work of the	69
Modin, The resistance of	233	Pauperism, Prevention of chronic	168
Money-lending, Laws as to	166	Penitence	142
Moral duties	182	Pentateuch, The	100
		Pentecost, Feast of	128

	PAGE		PAGE
Perjury	81, 92	Punishment, Divine . . .	187
Phylacteries	147	" Eternal, Im-	
Polytheism, Origin of . .	20	possibility	
Poor-laws, Mosaic	163	of	188
Poverty, Rights of	163	" of false wit-	
Prayer, a means to an end	115	ness	93
" Careless	82	" of murder . . .	156
" Duty of	114, 190	" of theft	91
" for improve-		Purification of defiled	
ment	118	persons	210
" Forms of	115	<i>Purim</i> , Feast of	230
" influencing the		Purity, Duty of	205
posture of			
mind	118	QUIPUS, The Mexican . .	151
" Natural impulse			
to	119	REASON, Limits of . . .	275
" Reason for He-		Reasoning powers of man	47
brew	120	" upon the in-	
" Silent	119	finite	280
" The Prophets on	117	Rebellious son, Punish-	
" The Psalmist on		ment of	192
Unwritten	114, 117	Recognition of God . . .	115
" Pre-eminence of man	45	Reconciliation of incon-	
Priests as physicians . . .	194	gruities	280
" Blessing of the . .	115	Red Sea, Passage of . . .	73
" Misrepresentations		Refuge, Cities of	156
of	203	" Rejoicing in the Law "	135
" The kingdom of . .	103	Release, The Year of	
Property, Protection of . .	91	(<i>Shemitah</i>)	165
" Rights of	162	Relics, Worship of human	217
Prophecy	255	Religious toleration . . .	177
" and Revelation		Remains, Human, why	
consistent	256	regarded as unclean . .	214
Prophecies of the restora-		Remembrance, Day of . .	137
tion	260	Renan on Fundamental	
" Unfulfilled	260	Morality	183
Prophet, What consti-		Report, Raising a false . .	202
tuted a	256	Representative or typical	
Prophets, Moses chief of		laws	170
the	258	Respect for parents . . .	191
" The, on Im-		" the aged	191
mortality	247	Rest, The blessing of . . .	84
Protection of life and		Restoration, The hoped	
limb	161	for	268
Proverbs, on kindness to		Revelation a necessity . .	61
animals	209	" and Inspira-	
Psalms, The, on Immor-		tion	65
tality	245	" at Sinai	74
" on Sacrifice	112	" now proceed-	
Punishment, Capital . . .	156	ing	67
		" to Abraham . . .	69

INDEX

309

	PAGE		PAGE
Reversion to ownership in land	168	Sepulchre of Moses unknown	217
Reward and punishment	55, 253	" Holy (so-called)	217
Reward and Punishment, Foretaste of	253	Sepulchres all regarded as unclean	214
Rights of property	162	Servitude, Laws relating to	153
" poverty	163	" Penal	154
Royalty, Duties of	170	Sewage, Disposal of	213
Ruminants, cloven-footed	222	Sheaf, The forgotten	165
Ruskin on the Loving God	188	Sherlock on future reunion of Souls	250
SABBATH, The	82, 122	<i>Shophar</i> , The	138
" How to keep the	86	Silent Prayer	119
Sabbath-breaking, The punishment of	122	<i>Simchath Torah</i>	135
" The Prophets on	123	Sin, Natural consequences of	253
Sacrifice and Confession	110	Sinai, Revelation at	74
Sacrifices, Human	113	Slander	94, 204
" Justice better than	112	Slaughtering, Jewish mode of	221
" Maimonides' view of	113	Slavery among the Hebrews	153
" Obedience better than	111	Social duties	153
" Object of	110	Socrates on the dead body	217
" of fine flour	110	Solemn Assembly, Eighth day of	134
" Reason for institution of	109	Solomon's Prayer	179
" superseded	114	Son, Punishment of rebellious	192
" The first	105	Soul, The	49
Saints, Relics of alleged	216	" Immortality of the	49, 238
<i>Sanhedrin</i> , Election of	297	Speech, Power of	46
" Functions of	295	Spinoza on the contemplation of Death	238
" History of	295	Spirit-rapping	190
" Origin of	173	"Sport" not allowed	209
Sanitary Laws	210	Stanley, Dean, on Samaritan Passover	127
Scandal	94, 204	" on the influence of the Departed	218
"Searching" vitals of animals for disease	223	Statute of Distributions	170
Second crop, The	165	"Steal, Thou shalt not"	89
Securities for Loans	166	Strangers, Kindness to	177
<i>Seder</i> Nights, The	127	" Religious toleration to	179
Seething a kid in its mother's milk	223	<i>Succah</i> , The	133
Segregation of the Leper	211	Superstitious practices forbidden	190
Self-examination	138		
Seneca on the boon of Death	250		

	PAGE		PAGE
Supreme Court of Justice	173	Unity of design in steam-	
Swearing, False	81, 92	engine	12
Swine, Habits of the	223	" in Mosaic Code	99
Swine's flesh prohibited	223	" in Nature	13
Syrian invasion of Pales-		" in Revelation	80
tine	232	" of God proved from	
Nature		Nature	13
TABERNACLE, The, in the		Usury, Laws against	166
wilderness	108		
Tabernacle, The modern			
(<i>Succah</i>)	133	VOICE, The human	46
Tabernacles, The Feast of	131	Voltaire on the " Argu-	
Tale-bearing	204	ment from design "	274
<i>Talith</i> , The	150		
<i>Talmud</i> , Origin of the	301	WAR, Cause of	198
Temple, Loss of the	229	" unmasked	199
Ten Commandments	78	Waste in creation, Ab-	
Tennyson on Prayer	117	sence of	19
<i>Tephillin</i> (Phylacteries)	147	Weak, Triumph of the	235
Theft, Punishment of	91	Wealth, Prevention of ex-	
Thrift	91	cessive	168
Tithe, The	166, 283	Weeks, Feast of	128
Toleration, Religious	177	Witness, The false	92
<i>Torah</i> , The (Holy Law)	100	Work, a duty	84
Trading, Dishonest	199	" disinterested	254
<i>Trija</i> (unfit for food)	223	Wounded animals not	
Trophies of nature	134	allowed as food	223
Truth	201		
" Permanence of as-		YEAR of Jubilee	168
certained	282	" Release	165
<i>Tsitsith</i> , The (Fringes)	151	" The Sabbatical	167
Typical laws	170		
UNDIVIDED homage to		ZECHARIAH's Prophecies	267
God	189	Zionism, The true	261, 268

THE END